4651



# FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case reference	:	LON/00AJ/OLR/2018/0635
Property	:	40 Drayton Bridge Road, London W7 1EX
Applicant	:	Suzanne Janet Perrin-Gerrard
Representative	:	Oliver Fisher Solicitors
Respondent	:	Peter McCann (Missing landlord)
Representative	:	
Type of application	:	Section 51 of the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993
Tribunal members	:	Tribunal Judge Dutton Mr L Jarero BSc FRICS
Date of determination and venue	:	18 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 at 10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR
Date of decision	4 #	18 <sup>th</sup> June 2018

## DECISION

¥

# Summary of the tribunal's decision

The appropriate premium payable for the new lease is £37,713 as set out on the attached valuation.

# **Background**

- 1. On 21<sup>st</sup> July 2017 the Applicant commenced proceedings in the County Court at Central London under claim number Do2CLo26 pursuant to section 50 of the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 ("the Act") for a determination of the premium to be paid for the grant of a new lease of 40 Drayton Bridge Road, London W7 1EX (the "Property").
- 2. By an Order dated  $28^{th}$  March 2018, amongst other matters, the claim was transferred to this Tribunal for the purposes of determining the premium payable and to approve the form of the new lease. It is noted that the costs of the Applicant had been assessed at £6,000 including VAT and that sum was to be deducted from the amount we found to be payable for the premium
- 3. In support of the application we were provided with a copy of a report from Mr David Field FRICS of Ringley, chartered surveyors dated  $28^{\text{th}}$ June 2016. However this report was, it would seem, for the purposes of advising the Applicant on a figure which could be inserted in the Initial Notice. Three scenarios were contemplated giving values of £42,115 from the Landlord's point of view, £33,170 as a possible settlement figure and £22,375 as a figure to be inserted in the Initial Notice.
- 4. By a later report prepared by Gordon Loughran MRICS of Allied Surveyors and Valuers Limited dated  $31^{st}$  May 2018 a figure of £36,200 was advanced as being the premium payable. This report has the correct valuation date, has been prepared for the purposes of an application under sections 50 and 51 of the Act and contains the usual expert's declaration.
- 5. It is said by the solicitors for the Applicant that the figures suggested in the two reports are "considerably different". It is not wholly clear what the purpose was of including the first report. It pre-dates the valuation date and was not provided for the purposes of determining the premium payable following an application to the Court under the Act. It contains no declaration. In addition it is noted that the possible settlement figure is not far removed from the value attributed by Mr Loughran.
- 6. Mr Loughran's report speaks to a capitalisation rate of 6%, a deferment rate of 5.25%, a long lease value of £420,000 with a 1% discount from freehold to long leasehold. As to relativity Mr Loughran has suggested a rate of 85.43% based on an adjusted Savills graph and a Gerald Eve Graph.

### The tribunal's determination

- 7. We find that the report of Mr Field should not be considered by us for the reasons set out above at paragraph 5.
- 8. We therefore confine our decision to considering the report of Mr Loughran. We have considered the comparable evidence put forward and accept the long lease value of £420,000.
- 9. The uplift of 1% for the freehold is uncontentious and we are in agreement with the capitalisation rate of 6%. The deferment rate of 5.25%, for the reasons set out in Mr Loughran's report is noted, but not accepted by us. As he himself says there must be compelling evidence to depart from the 5% set by the Upper Tribunal in Sportelli and as revisited by the Court of Appeal. In this case it is said that the repairing obligations are a "little ambiguous". The lease is, in effect a full repairing and insuring lease. We do not see that this imposes any management problems justifying the departure from the 'Sportelli' rate of 5%.
- 10. Mr Loughran has advanced arguments to support his view on relativity. We have noted all that has been said. He appears to be arguing for a relativity based on the Savills enfranchiseable graph of 87.20% from which he has deducted 3.25% to represent the discount for the "No Act World". This he says gives a percentage of 83.95%. However he then adopted the Gerald Eve Graph of 86.66% and the Savills figure, which he includes at 84.20%, which is inexplicably inconsistent with the his earlier assessment of 83.95% to achieve an average of 85.43%. If we apply the 86.66% and 83.95% we find a relativity of 85.30%. In accepting, in this case, his views on the basis of calculating relativity for this lease, we find that the rate should be 85.30%, following his own figures.
- 11. Applying these elements to the valuation we find that the premium to be paid for the new lese is  $\pounds$ 37,713 as set out on the attached valuation.
- 12. The terms of the extended lease, the draft of which was included in the bundle before us is approved (see tab 11 of the bundle) save that we consider that the grant should be with limited title guarantee and that the signature clause should be amended to provide for execution by a District Judge of the County Court as set out at paragraph 2 of the said Order.

Name: Tribunal Judge Dutton	Date:	18th June 2018
-----------------------------	-------	----------------

#### <u>Rights of appeal</u>

By rule 36(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, the tribunal is required to notify the parties about any right of appeal they may have.

If a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), then a written application for permission must be made to the First-tier Tribunal at the regional office which has been dealing with the case.

The application for permission to appeal must arrive at the regional office within 28 days after the tribunal sends written reasons for the decision to the person making the application.

If the application is not made within the 28 day time limit, such application must include a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28 day time limit; the tribunal will then look at such reason(s) and decide whether to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed, despite not being within the time limit.

The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the tribunal to which it relates (i.e. give the date, the property and the case number), state the grounds of appeal and state the result the party making the application is seeking.

If the tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

#### First Tier Tribunal (Property Chamber)

Appendix A

Ref: GM/LC

GM/LON/00AJ/OLR/2018/0635

#### 40 Drayton Bridge Road London W7 1EX

ан (1997) Алтан (1997)

Valuation Date	21 July 2017			
Lease granted for 99 years from 25 De	combor 1087			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
Unexpired term	69.43 years			
Ground rent	£100 pa until 2020			
	£200 until 2053			
	£300 for the remainder			
Unimproved vacant freehold value	£424,242			
Extended lease value	£420,000			
Capitalisation rate	6%			
	5%			
Deferment rate				
Value of existing lease	£361,878			
Relativity	85.30%			
Valuation of Freeholder's current in	erest			
Ground rent - 1st period	£100			
YP 3.43 years @ 6.%	3.0193		£302	
Ground rent - 2nd period	£200		1002	
YP 33 years @ 6%	14.2302			
Deferred 3.43 yrs @ 6%	0.8188		£2,330	
Ground rent - 3rd period	£300			
YP 33 years @ 6%	14.2302			
Deferred 36.43 yrs @ 6%	0.1197		£511	
Reversion to freehold value	£424.242			
Deferred 69.43 yrs @ 5%	0.0338		£14,339	
	0.0556	-	£14,553	£17,482
Freeholder's current value				417 <sub>1</sub> 402
Value after grant of extended lease				
Ground rent for 159.43 years	£0			
Reversion to freehold value	£424.242			
Deferred 159.43 yrs @ 5%	0.0004186			£178
	0.0001100		_	
Diminution in freeholder's interest				£17,304
Marriage Value				
Value after enfranchisement				
Freeholders interest	£178			
Tenant's interest	£420,000	£420,178		
	11201000	21201110		
Value before enfranchisement				
Freeholders interest from above	E17 400			
Tenant's interest	£17,482 £361,878	£379,360		
	1301,870			
Marriage value		£40,818	000 400	
Divide equally between parties			£20,409	£20,409

Premium payable to freeholder

£37,713